ERIC Document Resume | See Instruction Sheet | DATE OF RESUME | DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER: ED001679
2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).: N.A.
3. IDENTIFICATION NO.: N.A.

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S): Saleem, Betty L. and Miller, S.M.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED: The Neglected Dropout: The Returnee

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE: YES [X] NO [ ]

COPYRIGHT GRANTED: YES [ ] NO [X]

6. PUBLICATION TITLE: N.A.

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED: YES [ ] NO [ ]

7. EDITOR(S): N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN: Youth Development Center, Syracuse University, 926 S. Crouse, Syracuse, New York

TYPE OF REPORT: PROPOSAL [ ] IN-PROGRESS [ ] FINAL [X] FOLLOW-UP [ ]

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE: Syracuse University, Youth Development Center, 926 S. Crouse Ave., Syracuse, N.Y.

| 10. VOL. | 11. PAGES | 12. MO./YR. | 13. TOTAL PP. |
|---|---|---|---|
| N.A. | N.A. | Jul 63 | 58 |

TELE. EXT. INST/LOC CODE

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR: research report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| school dropouts | educational surveys | culturally disadvantaged | Madison Area Project | |
| dropout returnees | secondary education | low income | MAP | |
| student attitudes | communication | family stability | | |
| | | economic stability | | |

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

At least 60 of the 625 students who dropped out of the Syracuse, New York, public schools in 1959-60 later returned to school, and many graduated. An attempt was made to discover why these students returned, what kinds of students were most influenced by advice to finish high school, and which students experienced the most pressure to return. Some characteristics of those who returned were sought by comparing returnee and non-returnee dropouts. Thirty-three tables are presented based on the statistics of the findings.

Returnees were generally characterized by better academic standing and a greater degree of economic and family stability. Both factors were significant for girls while economic stability proved more significant for the boys. The data indicate that returnees are not clearly distinguishable from dropouts. The two groups overlap considerably. Whenever returnees were "better off," socially or academically, than non-returnees, the differentiation was slight. The limited systematic differences indicate that situational and idiosyncratic factors may be of greater importance.

This failure to identify significant differences led to the conclusion that better communication with the broad population of dropouts would be the most effective method of increasing the number of school returnees.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

Mulligan

ED001679

# THE NEGLECTED DROPOUT:

# THE RETURNEE

Betty L. Saleem
S. M. Miller

Syracuse University Youth Development Center
926 South Crouse Avenue
Syracuse 10, New York

July, 1963

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# THE NEGLECTED DROPOUT: THE RETURNEE[1]

In recent years there has been a great deal of literature dealing with young people who leave school before graduation from high school.[2] Assumptions in this literature are that "stay-in-school" pressures and propaganda affect only those who have not yet left school and that a youth's education is terminated once he has dropped out. Neglected are those young people who drop out but later seek more education.

The major concern of this paper is to see if those who return to school are a group or groups of dropouts unique in terms of school performance, social background or personal characteristics. The decision to return might be easier for a youth who comes from a middle class environment where the individuals he respects are likely to support his return to school. It might be easier, also, if he had been relatively successful, academically and socially, in the school setting, and if his return were welcomed, rather than decried by students and teachers. He would be rewarded for conforming to the educational norms rather than put on the defensive for changing his mind.

We are concerned to see if the "returnees" can be identified in advance, for then the schools might be able to pay special attention to them as they leave and re enter. Returning to school does not necessarily lead to graduation, but a better understanding of the returnees and their motives could lead to programs which would increase the number of returnees who do graduate. Furthermore, if it is known what conditions prompt re entry, some similar conditions might be simulated to encourage more dropouts to complete their education. It may be, on the other hand, that those who return are not unique in any way and that the return to school is based on less systematic factors. In either case, the returnee should not be neglected; his school

career is different from that of the permanent dropout and that of the student who has an uninterrupted school life.

There are few, if any, studies of youth who end and then resume their education. In a recent bibliography on dropouts,[3] it was noted that only a few of the studies recognized that some dropouts do return to school; most researchers do not even specify whether or not their samples of dropouts include returnees.

Although the present report does not meet the criteria of a rigorous study, it provides some interesting data on a population which has been neglected by school systems and researchers.

Methods of Research and Study Groups

The Youth Development Center of Syracuse University, with the cooperation of the New York State Division for Youth, undertook a study of school dropouts in the spring of 1962. The subjects of the study were all the students who left junior or senior public high schools in Syracuse, New York, during the 1959-60 school year without completing graduation requirements, excluding those who had transferred to other schools. The method of research was a survey of existing records; the school records of these dropouts were checked, as were the records of the New York State Employment Service, the Central Registry of Juvenile Offenders, the Syracuse Police Department, the Armed Forces Examination Station and the Onondaga County Welfare Drpartment. The Syracuse City Directories of 1958, 1959, and 1960 were consulted for information regarding residence and parents' occupations.[4]

There were 625 dropouts from the Syracuse schools during the 1959 60 school year. During the survey it was learned that 60 of these dropouts had returned to school and that some had actually graduated. These 60 youths

were classified as "returnees"; the remaining 565 were classified as permanent dropouts and studied in an earlier publication.[5] In the present report the 565 permanent dropouts and 60 returnees will be compared in an effort to ascertain any differences between them that might lead to predictability of which dropouts would eventually return.[6]

The information on "return to school" was gained by chance; there was no systematic check of night school or summer school records. It is very likely, therefore, that some of the 565 dropouts also received further training.[7] Some youth may have been eliminated from the study entirely because they had dropped out and returned during the same year; thus they were not included as dropouts nor as returnees.

"Returning to school" does not necessarily indicate a final acceptance of school and eventual graduation; rather, it is an omnibus term referring to several types of educational experience. Some of the returnees in this study attended night school or summer school almost immediately after leaving day school and soon completed the requirements for graduation. Others are still working toward their diplomas by taking a few credits at night school each semester or through a correspondence course. A few finished in a shorter time by returning to day school full time. Four girls sought some further training in a business school. They are included as returnees since they could have received that training in a regular high school. Far from all of the returnees graduated from high school; some remained in school only two or three months. Some students may leave school and return several times before leaving the final time. For some of the permanent dropouts in this study the 1959 or 1960 leaving was a second dropout; they had left earlier, perhaps in 1958, decided to return, and then left again in 1959-60.

Because the two groups, returnees and permanent dropouts, do overlap somewhat and because there is not a complete accounting of all returnees, it was not feasible to calculate returnee rates.[3] Also, interpretation of the data must be very cautious. Despite the unsystematic and incomplete procedure af distinguishing returnees from dropouts, statistically significant differences between the two groups appeared on certain variables. These differences are worth considering as possible indications that returnees are a particular type or types of dropouts and may provide an initial step in identifying which dropouts are likely to seek further education. The most impressing result may be, however, the limited range of differences between dropouts and returnees, suggesting that for many returnees situational factors may be important.

Sex Ratios

It would be expected that boys would be under greater pressure than girls to complete high school because of future obligations to support a family. This study, however, did not reveal a large sex difference in the propensity to return. Boys left school more frequently than girls (55 per cent of the dropouts were males, 45 per cent females), and they also returned to school more frequently, and in approximately the same proportions (60 per cent of the returnees were males, 40 per cent females).

Table 1

The failure of boy dropouts to return in significantly greater proportions than girl dropouts may be explained by three possible factors. First, girls as well as boys, are audience to the stay-in school propaganda. Second, girls may experience at least as much discrimination as boys in the job market due to their lack of a high school diploma. Third, girls usually

do better than boys in school and therefore might be more willing to return, even though a diploma is not necessary to be a housewife. In fact, it will be shown that girl returnees had reached higher grade levels than boy returnees and were less retarded academically.

Because of the sex differences in school performance and in family and social background, sex will be controlled in all comparisons of dropouts and returnees.

The Dropout and the Returnee in the School Setting

1. Age at time of leaving school

The age at which a young person leaves school may be a factor in whether or not he feels enough at home in the school setting to return to it after a dropout experience. Also, by the time a boy or girl is 17 or 18 years old he may feel he should be earning his own living rather than continuing to be a dependent on his parents. To ascertain whether or not age did make a difference, the age reached by each youth at his last birthday before dropping out was calculated.

Table 2-

The age distributions for dropouts and returnees were almost identical. In both groups the modal age for leaving was 16, the minimum legal school-leaving age in New York State. The mean age in both cases was approximately 17.

With sex held constant, some differences appeared, but they were not statistically significant. Among the boys, returnees were less likely than dropouts (50 per cent and 56 per cent respectively) to have left school after reaching age 17. Among the girls, the trend was in the opposite direction; returnee girls were more likely than dropout girls (54 per cent

and 45 per cent respectively) to have left school after their seventeenth birthday. Perhaps it is more important for boys than for girls not to be "too old" to return to school

On the whole, however, it seems that age at dropout did not make a difference in whether or not the dropout would seek further training. More important, as shown below, was the age of a dropout in relation to his grade attainment; that is, grade retardation.

2. Grade level achieved

One of the factors most clearly separating the returnees from the permanent dropouts was the grade level reached but not completed by a youth before he left school.[9] Approximately four-fifths of the returnees and only three-fifths of the dropouts had reached grades 10, 11 or 12. This difference was statistically significant[10] at the .01 level; that is, it could have occurred by chance only once in 100 times. (See Table 4.) With sex controlled, the difference remained significant, but at the .05 level of significance; that is, it could have occurred by chance only 5 in 100 times. (See Tables 5 and 6.)

Tables 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7-

Although there were statistically significant differences between the dropouts and returnees, it must be pointed out that more than 45 per cent of both groups were in grades 10 or 11 when they left school. In spite of the differences, there was much overlap in grade achievement.

While returnees had reached higher grade levels than had dropouts, this was more true of girls than of boys. Girl returnees were more likely than boy returnees (or dropouts) to have reached the two highest grades, 11 or 12. This difference was significant at the .05 level. (See Table 7.) Thus, among

girls, the majority (71 per cent) of the returnees were in grades 11 or 12, as compared with 42 per cent of dropouts. Among boys, the majority (64 per cent) of returnees were in grades 10 or 11, as compared with 45 per cent of dropouts. (See Table 3.)

Table 8 gives the percentage of all dropouts (returnees and permanent dropouts) at each grade level, who returned to school.[11] As the grade level increased, the percentage of returnees increased without exception. Only 3.6 per cent of those who were in grade 7 or 8 when they left school returned for further education, while 15.1 per cent of those in grade 12 did so. Similar relationships existed with sex controlled.

Table 8

This table revealed the same sex difference as that implied by Tables 5 and 7 -- that nearness to graduation was less important for boys than for girls. Boys were as likely to return in grades 10 or 11 as in grade 12 (13 to 14 per cent in each of the three grades were returnees), while girls were much more likely to return in grade 12 (17 per cent) than in any other grade.

3. Grade Retardation

Grade retardation was calculated by comparing the grade level achieved by each youth when he left with the grade level normal for his age group. For example, a person who was 16 when he entered the tenth grade was one year retarded, since most youth begin the tenth grade at age 15.

Tables 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13

Returnees were significantly more likely than dropouts (68 per cent and 45 per cent respectively) to be at their normal grade level or only one year behind. (See Table 10.) The difference remained significant with

sex controlled. (See Tables 11 and 12.) For either sex, however, the greatest difference between returnees and dropouts was in the "0 years retarded" category. Of the returnees, 33 per cent were not retarded, as compared with only 17 per cent of the dropouts; this difference was statistically significant ($X^2 = 8.64$; df = 1; P .01).

The percentage of all dropouts (permanent and returning) who returned at each degree of retardation was calculated, and an inverse relationship appeared: the less the retardation, the greater the propensity to return. This relationship held for both boys and girls. The importance of the factor of retardation can be seen by the fact that although 17.1 per cent of those who were not retarded when they left school returned, only 6.3 per cent returned of those who were four or more years retarded.

Table 14

The school is a severely age graded culture. Anyone much older or younger than his classmates is made to feel out of place, and a scholastically retarded dropout might be unlikely to return to such an uncomfortable situation, especially since the dropout period would increase the degree of retardation.

Tables 3 and 7 showed that girl returnees reached higher grade levels than did boy returnees; they were also more likely to be at their normal grade level or only minimally retarded. Of the girls, 87 per cent were at the grade level normal for their age or only one year retarded, as compared with only 56 per cent of the boys. This difference was statistically significant. (See Table 13.) Almost half (46 per cent) of the girl returnees were not retarded at all, as shown in Table 9. Almost half (45 per cent) of the boy returnees, on the other hand, were 2 or more years retarded, as compared with only 12 per cent of the girl returnees. Thus, girl returnees

probably had performed much better in school than boy returnees or any of the permanent dropouts. This may have been a major factor in their return. Since a large number of boy returnees were quite retarded scholastically, it may be that factors other than relative success in school prompted their return.

4. Intelligence Quotient

Intelligence test scores were reported for only one half of the returnees (13 girls and 17 boys) and for fewer than one-half of the drop-outs (42 per cent). This is one reason for exercising extreme caution in the interpretation of the I. Q. data. Other limitations were that the tests were given at diverse age levels and that various I. Q. tests were used, with no adjustment made to correct for the varying means and standard deviations of the tests. The majority of the scores were, however, from the California Test of Mental Maturity. Of the 30 scores for returnees, 24 were determined by this test as were 162 of the 236 scores (68 persons) for dropouts.

Tables 15 and 16-

From the limited data available it seems that returnees did score higher on intelligence tests than did the dropouts. The mean I. Q. of the returnees was 97.5 and of dropouts 92.8. The girls were the main contributor to this difference, however; there was only one percentage difference between male dropouts and male returnees. While the groups did not differ on the percentage in the very low I. Q. range (60 79), returnees were more likely than dropouts to fall in the high category (100-122); more than one-half of the returnees and only slightly more than one-quarter of the dropouts had scores of 100 or above. This latter

difference was statistically significant at the .01 level. (See Table 16.)

In the dropout group there was little difference between boys and girls. Among the returnees, however, the girls had a mean I. Q. of 101.5, whereas the boys' mean I. Q. was 94.4. Girls were more likely than boys to fall in the 100 or above range; 9 of the 13 girls and only 7 of the 17 boys had scores of at least 100. This difference was not statistically significant. The intelligence quotients again indicate the relative academic superiority of the girl returnees as compared with boy returnees and all dropouts. For the boys, intelligence seemed to be less of a factor in their return than for girls, since more than a third (36 per cent) of them had low I. Q.'s of 89 or below, and another quarter fell in the 90-99 I. Q. range.

Perhaps the higher grade achievement of the returnees, especially the girls, was reflected in the I. Q. scores; perhaps they gained more from their school careers, or perhaps they were of higher intelligence. In any case, they probably did have a better chance of succeeding when they returned to schoolthan the dropouts would have had.

5. Type of Further Education Received by Returnees

A majority of the returnees (66 per cent) continued their education in night school, rather than in day school (10 per cent). This was more true of boys (75 per cent) than of girls (54 per cent). By attending night school the young people, especially the boys, could maintain full-time jobs as well as work toward their diplomas. Another contributing factor might be that by going to night school they did not have to return to the school culture they had left, perhaps as misfits or failures; neither were they placed in a class of youth much younger than they. In night school they were more likely to be with people like themselves.

Table 17-

6. Summary of Scholastic Situation

Returnees seemed to be a slightly higher level of dropout in terms of grade achievement, grade retardation and intelligence quotient. There was considerable overlap between the two groups, however, on all of these variables. Furthermore, not all of the returnees were higher level dropouts. Two of them were 19 years old when they left school, four were in grades 7 or 8, two were 4 or 5 years retarded, and four had I.Q.'s of 79 or below. At least in terms of academic performance, there are probably different types of returnees, just as there are different types of dropouts.

Girl returnees seemed to do even better in school than did the boy returnees. The large majority of the girl returnees were in grades 11 or 12, none or one year retarded, and had I.Q.'s of 100 or above. While boys were more likely to return if these characteristics applied, many of them were in grade 10 or below, 2 or 3 years retarded and had I.Q.'s of 70 to 99. Academic achievement in school was not so much a determining factor for boys as it was for girls; this finding probably reflects the greater pressur on all boys, whatever their school performance, to finish high school.

Family and Social Background of Dropouts and Returnees

1. Father's Occupation

An effort was made to determine whether or not returnees were of a higher socio-economic level than permanent dropouts. Three indicators were available: (1) socio-economic area of residence; (2) whether or not a family had received public welfare; and (3) father's occupation, as classified according to the U.S. census code groupings in the Alphabetical Index.[12] The latter indicator revealed no differences between dropouts and

returnees. The fathers of 23 per cent of the dropouts and 20 per cent of the returnees had white collar jobs. Approximately two-thirds of the fathers in both groups (64 per cent of dropouts' and 66 per cent of returnees' fathers) had blue collar jobs such as craftsmen, foremen and operatives.

Table 18-

There were sex differences consistent with other indicators showing that the girls in the returnee group came from less economically stable families than did the boys. A total of 26 per cent of the boys and only 11 per cent of the girls had fathers in white-collar occupations. Furthermore, fewer girls had fathers who were craftsmen or foremen. More than two-thirds of the girl's fathers (69 per cent) and only one-third of the boys' fathers were operatives, laborers, or in the private household and service occupations. Approximately equal proportions of boys' and girls' fathers in the dropout group fell in each occupational classification.

2. Social Welfare

Although returnees did not seem to have a better economic position than dropouts in terms of occupational level of father, the former did have the advantage of more economically stable families, if receipt of public welfare assistance is any indication. Although 42 per cent of the families of permanent dropouts had received welfare at some time since 1936, only 30 per cent of the returnees' families had; this only approached statisti cal significance. (See Table 20.) This difference held with sex controlled, but was still not statistically significant.

Tables 19 and 20-

In both groups, more girls than boys had families with county welfare

histories; among the returnees 22 per cent of the boys' families and 39 per cent of the girls' families had received welfare. Of those returnees' families which were listed at the County Welfare Department, most had received financial aid more than once.

3. Socio-economic Area of Residence

The somewhat better socio-economic position of the returnees is further shown by the residential patterns of the youth. The census tract in which the youth lived at the time of dropout was given a socio-economic rating of I(high) to VI(low). This rating was based on several variables and a composite index score was calculated for each tract. The information was obtained from 1950 census data. The variables involved were: (1) mean monthly rent for tenant occupied dwellings; (2) median market value for single-family owned homes; (3) percentage of single family dwellings; (4) median school year completed by adult residents 20 years old and over; and (5) percentage of all employed who were laborers, service workers and operatives. On the basis of these index scores the census tracts were grouped into the six ranked socio-economic areas.[13]

-Tables 21, 22, 23 and 24-

Only a few more returnees (21 per cent) than dropouts (14 per cent) lived in the three best areas I, II, and III. Returnees, however, were more likely to live in areas IV and V (59 per cent of returnees to 44 per cent of dropouts) and less likely to live in the worst area of the city, VI (20 per cent of returnees to 38 per cent of dropouts). Returnees, then, tended to live in slightly better areas than did dropouts.

By combining categories I through V and comparing the number of dropouts and returnees in these areas with those in area VI, a difference

appeared that was statistically significant at the .01 level. Excluding those for whom residence was not ascertained, 40 per cent of the dropouts and only 20 per cent of the returnees were living in area VI. (See Table 22.) The difference remained significant or nearly significant with sex controlled. (See Tables 23 and 24.)

Returnee boys were much better off than returnee girls; 31 per cent of the boys lived in areas I, II and III and only 8 per cent of the girls lived in these areas. The girl returnees were more likely than boy returnees (46 per cent and 22 per cent) to live in area V. Approximately equal proportions of each sex lived in areas IV and VI. Among the dropouts, however, the greatest boy-girl difference was in area VI; 43 per cent of girl dropouts and 35 per cent of boy dropouts lived in this worst area.

-Table 25-

The importance of socio-economic area of residence is further shown by Table 25. Of all those who left school in 1959-60, 30.0 per cent of those living in area I returned and only 5.2 percent of those living in area VI did so. The returnee rate was fairly consistent for areas II through V (11 to 14.5 per cent for each area.)

4. Family Situation

The type of family situation in which a youth lived when he left school might be a factor determining his success in school, his attitude toward school, and the possibility that he might return. A statistically significant difference was found in the proportion of each group living with both of their parents, that is, in an unbroken home. Excluding those for whom family situation was not ascertained, 76 per cent of

returnees and only 61 per cent of dropouts lived in an unbroken home (Table 27). When sex was controlled, only the difference between dropout and returnee girls approached significance (Table 29). More dropouts (20 per cent) than returnees (13 per cent) lived in one parent families (Table 26).

Tables 26, 27, 28 and 29.

Although the sex differences in each group were not great, more girl returnees than boy returnees (79 per cent and 72 per cent respectively) lived with both parents; in the dropout groups the opposite tendency occurred with more boys than girls (58 per cent and 53 per cent respectively) living with both parents.

It is important to note that the majority of both returnees and dropouts lived in a home not broken by death, divorce, separation or the like. Although more returnees than dropouts came from visibly stable families, a quarter of all returnees came from broken homes and more than half of those who did not return came from unbroken homes; therefore, this factor cannot account for all or even nearly all returnees.

5. Delinquency of Dropouts and Returnees

All youth who are involved with law enforcing agencies before they reach their sixteenth birthday are listed in the Syracuse Central Registry of Juvenile Offenders.[14] After a youth is 16 his offenses are recorded in the Syracuse Police Department. According to both the Central Registry and the Police records, dropouts and returnees did not differ in the extent of their delinquencies.

Tables 30 and 31.

The large majority of both groups (80 per cent) were <u>not</u> listed at the

Central Registry, and approximately nine tenths of both groups (88 per cent of dropouts and 90 per cent of returnees) were not listed at the Police Department. In both groups, more boys than girls were listed at each agency, but the differences were not significant. Most of the offenses of the returnees were not serious, although they ranged from malicious mischief to grand larceny. In summary, permanent dropouts were no more likely than returnees to become involved with a law enforcing agency.

6. Summary of Background Factors

Three factors were investigated in this section on family and social background: (1) economic stability (measured in terms of father's occupation, socio-economic area of residence and social welfare history of the family); (2) family stability (as indicated by the type of family situation in which a youth lived); and (3) delinquency. The latter factor showed no differences between returnees and dropouts. Father's occupation did not differentiate, but perhaps this was due to the gross occupational classifications used or to the partial character of the data.

All the other measures, however, consistently revealed that boys in each group came from more stable families than their girl counterparts. More boys in each group lived in the better socio-economic areas and had families without records of public welfare assistance. The only exception was that fewer girl than boy returnees had lived in broken homes.

The other important finding was that on each of these measures, without exception, fewer returnee boys than dropout boys and fewer returnee girls than dropout girls had experienced the unstable situation. It appears that in terms of family and social background as well as academic achievement, some returnees were somewhat higher level dropouts. This was true of both

boys and girls. Although girl returnees were "worse off" than boy returnees, they were "better off" than girl dropouts.

The differences between dropouts and returnees, while consistent, were never large, and some returnees came from unstable backgrounds. Furthermore, returnees were only slightly "better off". For example, returnees were more likely than dropouts to live in socio-economic areas IV and V, but they were not much more likely to live in areas I, II or III. In other words, there were indications that some returnees came from slightly more stable backgrounds than dropouts.

Analysis of Combined Characteristics

As shown in tables 6, 14, and 25, 15 per cent of those in grade 12 at the time of school leaving were returnees, as were 17 per cent of those who were not retarded in grade level and 30 per cent of those who lived in the highest socio-economic area. An analysis was made to determine whether or not a certain combination of characteristics would yield an even higher proportion of youth returning to school. The analysis was done separately for boys and girls. Father's occupation and intelligence quotient were available for only a portion of each group and therefore could not be used profitably in the analysis.

The fact that a family had not received public welfare did not contribute to the proportion returning. If anything, among youth with the three characteristics of living in the better socio-economic areas, higher grade levels and lower school retardation levels, receipt of welfare by the family may have increased, rather than decreased their chances of returning, although the numbers involved were too small to yield conclusive results. (See k and l of Table 32 and q or Table 33.,

Table 32

Of the boys who lived in the highest socio-economic area, 33 per cent were returnees (line b of Table 32); since the total N in this area was only 6, however, it is not a reliable measure. Of the boys in areas I through IV who were not scholastically retarded, 28 per cent returned (N = 18; see line g). As great a proportion of boys returned (28 per cent) in the group that lived in areas I through IV, were in grades 10 through 12 and were no more than one year retarded (N = 43; see line i). The combination of these three factors yielded the highest reliable proportion of returnee boys.

Table 33

Among girls a high proportion of returnees was found in each of several combinations of factors (lines i, j, k, m, and q of Table 33). In each case, however, the numbers were too small to yield conclusive evidence. It does seem that being in grade 12, not retarded, living in areas I through IV, and coming from an unbroken home all contribute to the propensity to return for girls.

The combination of factors yielding the highest reliable proportion of girls returning was that of living in socio-economic areas I through V, not more than one year retarded, in grades 11 or 12 at the time of leaving, and coming from an unbroken home (line p, Table 33). Of the girls exhibiting these four characteristics, 29 per cent (N = 35) returned to school.

If data were available for the entire sample on all variables and the total number in the sample were larger, a more inclusive analysis could be made. This limited analysis seems to indicate, however, that youth who rank "high" on several academic and social variables (e.g. in grade 12,

unbroken rather than broken home, etc.) are more likely than others to return.

Conclusions

At present there is a good deal of emphasis being placed on graduation from high school and on discouraging youngsters from dropping out of school. At least 60 of the 625 students who dropped out of the Syracuse, New York, schools in 1959-60 later returned to school (mostly to night school), and many of these graduated. Who did return? What kinds of youngsters were most influenced by advice to finish high school, and what kinds had the most pressure put on them to return? Unfortunately, in this survey these two factors could not be separated, but some characteristics of those who returned were determined by comparing the returnees with the dropouts who did not return.

It was found that returnees were generally better academically than dropouts, using grade attained, grade retardation and intelligence quotient as indicators, but this was more true of girls than of boys. On each dimension, the girl returnees were of a higher level than boy returnees, and the differences between girl returnees and dropouts were greater than the differences between boy returnees and dropouts.

Returnees were also "better off" than dropouts in terms of economic and family stability; this was true of both boys and girls. In both groups, the boys more frequently than girls came from the better socio-economic areas and less frequently came from families receiving social welfare. Among returnees, girls less frequently came from broken homes.

These data seem to indicate that academic achievement or ability and an unbroken home are more important factors for girls in returning to school

than forboys. Economic stability of the family, however, is a more important factor for boys than for girls in inducing a return to school

It should not be assumed that the factors of academic ability or social class operated independently on the decision to return to school. It may be that the few who had been relatively successful in school or those who were from the higher social classes or more stable families were subjected to more pressures to return than were others, not only by their parents, but also by teachers, the New York State Employment Service, and the like. It may be, too, that the greater economic security of some returnees made it possible for them to return to school, or that their lesser school retardation meant that a return would be less of a challenge.

In spite of the observed differences, the data most strongly indicate that returneesare not clearly distinguishable from dropouts. The two groups overlap considerably. Not all of the returnees were from intact homes, for example, and more than half of the dropouts (56 per cent) were living with both parents. Furthermore, whenever returnees were "better off" socially or academically, they were only slightly "better off". More returnees than dropouts came from socio-economic areas IV and V, for example, but approximately equal proportions came from the best areas, I, II and III.

The limited systematic differences indicate that situational and idiosyncratic factors may be of great importance in whether or not a youth returns to school after leaving it. It is probably those youth who have been led to believe that the school and teachers would be receptive to their return who are most likely to make the plunge back into the school setting. An employer or an adult may encourage them to return. They may come into contact with the school in some way or another.

The likely significance of such factors suggests that the building of roads back to school could be effective. It might be well to escape from the lock-step interpretation of school that everyone must move through broadly the same material at the same pace and for the same length of time. There may be those who can move effectively through school in the usual manner of 12 consecutive years; others may need a period of being a dropout--the lower-class equivalent of the traditional upper-class Wanderjahr or two--before they are ready to complete high school or begin specialized training. They should not be considered renegades from school, reluctantly admitted only if they show firm signs of "good behavior." Rather, we should institutionalize second, third and fourth chances and roads to education.

Without any real effort, the school system studied had at least 10 per cent and possibly as many as 25 per cent of its 1959-60 dropouts seek further training after leaving. With a deliberate aim to help these youth, many more early school leavers would return to the educational path. Obviously, school dropout programs aimed at encouraging return to school might gain some early successes by concentrating on the dropouts who ranked high on variables such as higher school grade, unbroken home, etc. The wide distribution of returnee characteristics underlies, however, the likely effectiveness of systematic attempts to encourage further education among a broad range of the dropout population.

Filling in the primary prevention of premature school leaving, increasing attention should be paid to the secondary prevention stage of reducing the period during which the individual suffers the handicap of limited education.

## Footnotes

1. The collection of much of the data utilized in this report was made possible by the financial support of the New York State Division for Youth. The analysis was supported in part by a research grant from the Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
2. We find it useful to distinguish various gross patterns of dropouts: "push-outs," who are overtly or covertly ejected by the school; "fall-outs," who dislike school but not strongly and leave early; and "run-outs," who extremely dislike school and exit as soon as they can.
3. Miller, S. M., Saleem, Betty and Bryce, Herrington. School Dropouts: A Commentary and Annotated Bibliography. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Youth Development Center, 1963 (forthcoming). A study that does deal directly with the post-dropout educational experiences of school dropouts is Bert I. Greene, "Continuing Education and the High School Drop-out," Adult Education, XII, 2 (Winter, 1962), 76-83. This study reported that 18 of 48 dropouts had received education or training of some type since leaving school approximately 11 years earlier: 5 had attended a trade school; 8 had taken a correspondence course; 4 had taken some adult education course; and 4 had an apprenticeship. About half as many dropouts as graduates participated in each form of further education. Although 18 dropouts had taken some course, only 12(25 per cent of all dropouts) completed some course.
4 Syracuse, a city with a mixed industrial base, had a population of 216,038, according to the 1960 census. The racial distribution was 94.3 per cent white, 5.2 per cent Negro and .5 per cent "other." The median grade level completed for all persons 25 years old and over was 11.1; 44 per cent had graduated from high school, and 11 per cent

had graduated from college. The median family income was $6,247; 33.5 per cent of all families had an annual income of less than $5,000; 48.4 per cent, $5,000-$9,999; and 18.0 per cent, $10,000 or more. Of all persons in the labor force, 14 years old and over, 5.1 per cent of the males were unemployed in 1960, and 3.8 per cent of the females were unemployed. Of all employed males and females, 49 per cent were white collar workers, and 51 per cent were blue collar workers. Of the employed males, 13.7 per cent were professional, technical and kindred workers; 10.4 per cent were managers, officers and proprietors; 17.7 per cent were clerical or sales workers; 18.8 per cent were craftsmen or foremen; 19.2 per cent were operatives; 7.9 per cent were service workers; 6.0 per cent were laborers, and for 6.4 per cent the occupation was not ascertained. Of all employed males and females, one-third (31.3 per cent) worked in manufacturing industries. (U. S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Censuses of Population and Housing: 1960. Census Tracts. Final Report PHC (1)-154. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1962, pp. 15, 42.)

5. Miller, S. M., Cornings, Carolyn and Saleem, Betty. The School Dropout Problem: Syracuse, New York State Division for Youth and Syracuse University Youth Development Center; 1963

6. There were two other permanent dropouts (making a total of 567) who are eliminated from this report. They were mistakenly classified as returnees and omitted from the previous report on dropouts. In such a large study group (565) an additional two would not change the calculations greatly, and it seemed preferable to keep the data in the present report comparable to that in the earlier report.

7. In 1962, interviews were held with 98 of the 625 dropouts and returnees. Most of the interviews were conducted by members of a research class of the School of Social Work at Syracuse University, conducted by Maurice Connery. The results were reported in Baldwin, Kenneth, et al. "The Syracuse Drop-Out---Two Years Later," unpublished group Master's Thesis, School of Social Work, Syracuse University, 1962. Of the 98 interviewed, 13 were returnees and 85 were permanent dropouts. The new information in the interviews revealed, however, that of the 85 permanent dropouts, 12 (or 14 per cent) had also received further education. Thus, it is possible that of the 565 here classified as permanent dropouts, more than one-seventh may also be returnees.

   Additional information obtained from the interviews will not be used in this report since it is available for only a small sample of dropouts and returnees.

8. Of the 98 who were interviewed, a total of 25 dropouts (13 returnees and 12 of those classified as permanent dropouts) had returned to school. This indicates that perhaps one-quarter of all the 1959-60 dropouts returned for further education.

9. A youth who dropped out during the summer vacation was credited with the grade level he would have been in had he continued that fall.

10. $X^2$ was used to determine statistical significance. Statisticians frequently suggest that Yates' correction of $X^2$ be used when a 2 x 2 contingency table is used. Therefore, where $X^2$ is reported, $Xy^2$ (Yates' correction) is also reported. In only a few cases did the use of Yates' correction make a difference in whether or not there was statistical significance.

11. Because of the incomplete accounting of returnees and the overlap of the two groups, these figures should not be taken as representing actual returnee rates; they are presented here for analytical purposes only.

12. U. S. Bureau of the Census. 1960 Census of Population, Alphabetical Index of Occupations and Industries (rev. ed.). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960

13. Willie, Charles V. "Socio-Economic and Ethnic Areas of Syracuse, New York" (Unpublished doctoral disseratation, Syracuse University, 1957).

14. Cary, Lee J. and Hardt, Robert H. The Central Registry. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Youth Development Center, 1961.

TABLE 1

SEX OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

| Sex | Dropouts | | Returnees | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % |
| Male | 313 | 55 | 36 | 60 |
| Female | 252 | 45 | 24 | 40 |
| TOTAL | 565 | 100 | 60 | 100 |

TABLE 2

AGE AT DROPOUT OF

PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES, BY SEX

| Age* | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 14, 15 | 12 | 4 | 13 | 5 | 25 | 4 | --- | --- | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| 16 | 124 | 39 | 125 | 50 | 249 | 44 | 18 | 50 | 10 | 42 | 28 | 47 |
| 17 | 90 | 29 | 78 | 31 | 168 | 30 | 9 | 25 | 9 | 37 | 18 | 30 |
| 18 | 63 | 20 | 24 | 9 | 87 | 15 | 8 | 22 | 3 | 13 | 11 | 18 |
| 19 | 15 | 5 | 9 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| 20, 21 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 10 | 2 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| N. A. | 2 | 1 | --- | --- | 2 | 1 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL | 313 | 100 | 252 | 100 | 565 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 60 | 100 |

*Age refers to age reached by youth at last birthday before leaving school.

Boy dropouts: $\bar{X} = 16.9$
Girl dropouts: $\bar{X} = 16.6$

Boy returnees: $\bar{X} = 16.8$
Girl returnees: $\bar{X} = 16.7$

TABLE 3

GRADE ATTAINED BY PERMANENT

DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES, BY SEX

| Grade | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 7-8, Sp* | 62 | 20 | 44 | 17 | 106 | 19 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 7 |
| 9 | 71 | 23 | 49 | 19 | 120 | 21 | 5 | 14 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 12 |
| 10 | 73 | 23 | 54 | 21 | 127 | 23 | 12 | 33 | 3 | 13 | 15 | 25 |
| 11 | 69 | 22 | 74 | 30 | 143 | 25 | 11 | 31 | 11 | 46 | 22 | 36 |
| 12 | 33 | 10 | 29 | 12 | 62 | 11 | 5 | 14 | 6 | 25 | 11 | 18 |
| N. A. | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 1 | --- | --- | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 313 | 100 | 252 | 100 | 565 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 60 | 100 |

*Sp refers to non-graded classes for retarded or handicapped children.

Dropouts: $\bar{X} = 9.9$
Returnees: $\bar{X} = 10.5$
Total: $\bar{X} = 10.0$

TABLE 4

GRADE ATTAINED BY PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

CONDENSED TABLE

| Grade | Dropouts | | Returnees | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 7-9, Sp | 226 | 41 | 11 | 19 | 237 | 38 |
| 10-12 | 332 | 59 | 48 | 81 | 380 | 62 |
| TOTAL* | 558 | 100 | 59 | 100 | 617 | 100 |

*Excludes 7 dropouts and 1 returnee for whom grade attained was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 10.78$
$Xy^2 = 9.87$
df = 1
P < .01

TABLE 5

GRADE ATTAINED BY DROPOUT AND RETURNEE BOYS

CONDENSED TABLE

| Grade | Dropout Boys No. | % | Returnee Boys No. | % | Total Boys No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7-9, Sp | 133 | 43 | 8 | 22 | 141 | 41 |
| 10-12 | 175 | 57 | 28 | 78 | 203 | 59 |
| TOTAL* | 308 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 344 | 100 |

*Excludes 5 dropout boys for whom grade attained was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 5.85$
$Xy^2 = 5.02$
df = 1
P < .05

TABLE 6

GRADE ATTAINED BY DROPOUT AND RETURNEE GIRLS

CONDENSED TABLE

| Grade | Dropout Girls No. | % | Returnee Girls No. | % | Total Girls No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7-9, Sp | 93 | 37 | 3 | 13 | 96 | 35 |
| 10-12 | 157 | 63 | 20 | 87 | 177 | 65 |
| TOTAL* | 250 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 273 | 100 |

*Excludes 2 dropout girls and 1 returnee girl for whom grade attained was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 5.39$
$Xy^2 = 4.38$
df = 1
$P < .05$

TABLE 7

GRADE ATTAINED BY RETURNEES, BY SEX

CONDENSED TABLE

| Grade | Returnee Boys No. | % | Returnee Girls No. | % | Total Returnees No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7-10, Sp | 20 | 56 | 6 | 26 | 26 | 44 |
| 11-12 | 16 | 44 | 17 | 74 | 33 | 56 |
| TOTAL* | 36 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 59 | 100 |

*Excludes 1 girl for whom grade attained was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 4.94$
$Xy^2 = 3.80$
df = 1
P < .05

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE OF ALL DROPOUTS RETURNING TO SCHOOL

BY GRADE LEVEL ATTAINED AND BY SEX

| Grade | Boys | | | | Girls | | | | Total | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | Percent Who Are Returnees | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | Percent Who Are Returnees | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | Percent Who Are Returnees |
| 7 8,Sp | 62 | 3 | 65 | 4.6 | 44 | 1 | 45 | 2.2 | 106 | 4 | 110 | 3.6 |
| 9 | 71 | 5 | 76 | 6.6 | 49 | 2 | 51 | 3.9 | 120 | 7 | 127 | 5.5 |
| 10 | 73 | 12 | 85 | 14.1 | 54 | 3 | 57 | 5.3 | 127 | 15 | 142 | 10.6 |
| 11 | 69 | 11 | 80 | 13.8 | 74 | 11 | 85 | 12.9 | 143 | 22 | 165 | 13.3 |
| 12 | 33 | 5 | 38 | 13.2 | 29 | 6 | 35 | 17.1 | 62 | 11 | 73 | 15.1 |
| TOTAL* | 308 | 36 | 344 | 10.5 | 250 | 23 | 273 | 8.4 | 558 | 59 | 617 | 9.6 |

*Excludes 5 dropout boys, 2 dropout girls and 1 returnee girl for whom grade attained was not ascertained.

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF SCHOCL YEARS RETARDED OF PERMANENT

DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES, BY SEX

| Years Retarded* | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 0 | 32 | 10 | 65 | 26 | 97 | 17 | 9 | 25 | 11 | 46 | 20 | 33 |
| 1 | 77 | 25 | 70 | 28 | 147 | 26 | 11 | 30 | 9 | 38 | 20 | 33 |
| 2 | 105 | 34 | 65 | 26 | 170 | 30 | 10 | 28 | 2 | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| 3 | 63 | 20 | 34 | 13 | 97 | 17 | 4 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 8 |
| 4 or 5 | 19 | 6 | 11 | 4 | 30 | 5 | 2 | 6 | --- | --- | 2 | 3 |
| N. A. | 17 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 24 | 4 | --- | --- | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 313 | 100 | 252 | 100 | 565 | 99** | 36 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 60 | 99** |

*Refers to number of years retarded at time of leaving school, not at time of returning to school.

**Percentage does not total 100 due to rounding off.

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS RETARDED OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

CONDENSED TABLE

| Years Retarded | Dropouts No. | % | Returnees No. | % | Total No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0, 1 | 244 | 45 | 40 | 68 | 284 | 47 |
| 2-5 | 297 | 55 | 19 | 32 | 316 | 53 |
| TOTAL* | 542 | 00 | 59 | 100 | 600 | 100 |

*Excludes 24 dropouts and 1 retunee for whom years retarded was not ascertained.

$X^2_2 = 10.99$
$Xy = 10.10$
df = 1
P < .01

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS RETARDED OF DROPOUT AND RETURNEE BOYS

CONDENSED TABLE

| Years Retarded | Dropout Boys No. | % | Returnee Boys No. | % | Total Boys No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0, 1 | 109 | 37 | 20 | 56 | 129 | 39 |
| 2-5 | 187 | 63 | 16 | 44 | 203 | 61 |
| TOTAL* | 296 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 332 | 100 |

*Excludes 17 dropout boys for whom years retarded was not ascertained.

$X^2_2 = 4.74$
$Xy = 3.98$
df = 1
$P < .05$

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS RETARDED OF DROPOUT AND RETURNEE GIRLS

CONDENSED TABLE

| Years Retarded | Dropout Girls No. | % | Returnee Girls No. | % | Total Girls No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0, 1 | 135 | 55 | 20 | 87 | 155 | 58 |
| 2-5 | 110 | 45 | 3 | 13 | 113 | 42 |
| TOTAL* | 245 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 268 | 100 |

*Excludes 7 dropout girls and 1 returnee girl for whom years retarded was not ascertained.

$\chi^2 = 8.75$
$\chi y^2 = 7.49$
df = 1
$P < .01$

TABLE 13

NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS RETARDED OF RETURNEES, BY SEX

CONDENSED TABLE

| Years Retarded | Returnee Boys No. | % | Returnee Girls No. | % | Total Returnees No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0, 1 | 20 | 56 | 20 | 87 | 40 | 68 |
| 2 5 | 16 | 44 | 3 | 13 | 19 | 32 |
| TOTAL* | 36 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 59 | 100 |

*Excludes 1 girl for whom years retarded was not ascertained.

$\chi^2 = 6.34$
$\chi y^2 = 4.96$
df = 1
P < .05

TABLE 1½

PERCENTAGE OF ALL DROPOUTS RETURNING TO SCHOOL

BY NUMBER OF SCHOOL YEARS RETARDED AND BY SEX

| Years Retarded* | Boys | | | Percent Who Are Returnees | Girls | | | Percent Who Are Returnees | Total | | | Percent Who Are Returnees |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | |
| None | 32 | 9 | 41 | 22.0 | 65 | 11 | 76 | 14.5 | 97 | 20 | 117 | 17.1 |
| 1 | 77 | 11 | 88 | 12.5 | 70 | 9 | 79 | 11.4 | 147 | 20 | 167 | 12.0 |
| 2 | 105 | 10 | 115 | 8.7 | 65 | 2 | 67 | 3.0 | 170 | 12 | 182 | 6.6 |
| 3 | 63 | 4 | 67 | 6.0 | 34 | 1 | 35 | 2.9 | 97 | 5 | 102 | 4.9 |
| 4 or 5 | 19 | 2 | 21 | 9.5 | 11 | --- | 11 | 0. | 30 | 2 | 32 | 6.3 |
| TOTAL** | 296 | 36 | 332 | 10.8 | 245 | 23 | 268 | 8.6 | 541 | 59 | 600 | 9.8 |

* Refers to number of years retarded at time of leaving school, not at time of returning to school.

** All these returnees and dropouts for whom years retarded was not ascertained are excluded from this table.

TABLE 15

I. Q. SCORES OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS

AND RETURNEES, BY SEX

| I. Q. | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 60-69 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 7 | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| 70-79 | 13 | 10 | 12 | 12 | 25 | 11 | 3 | 18 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 13 |
| 80-89 | 33 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 58 | 25 | 3 | 18 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 13 |
| 90-99 | 42 | 32 | 38 | 37 | 80 | 34 | 4 | 24 | 2 | 15 | 6 | 20 |
| 100-109 | 26 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 44 | 18 | 5 | 29 | 6 | 46 | 11 | 37 |
| 110-122 | 15 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 22 | 9 | 2 | 12 | 3 | 23 | 5 | 17 |
| TOTAL* | 133 | 100 | 103 | 100 | 236 | 100 | 17 | 101** | 13 | 100 | 30 | 100 |

*No scores are available for 329 (58 per cent) of the dropouts and for 30 (50 per cent) of the returnees.

**Percentage does not total 100 due to rounding off.

Dropouts: $\bar{X} = 92.8$
Male dropouts: $\bar{X} = 93.4$
Female dropouts: $\bar{X} = 92.0$

Returnees: $\bar{X} = 97.5$
Male returnees: $\bar{X} = 94.4$
Female returnees: $\bar{X} = 101.5$

TABLE 16

I. Q. SCORES OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

CONDENSED TABLE

| I.Q. | Dropouts | | Returnees | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| 60-99 | 170 | 72 | 14 | 47 | 184 | 69 |
| 100-122 | 66 | 28 | 16 | 53 | 82 | 31 |
| TOTAL | 236 | 100 | 30 | 100 | 266 | 100 |

$X^2 = 8.03$
$Xy^2 = 6.89$
df = 1
P < .01

TABLE 17

TYPE OF FURTHER EDUCATION OF RETURNEES

| Type of Further Education | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Night School | 27 | 75 | 13 | 54 | 40 | 66 |
| Summer School | --- | --- | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| Day School | 3 | 8 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 10 |
| Correspondence Course | 1 | 3 | --- | --- | 1 | 2 |
| Business School | --- | --- | 4 | 16 | 4 | 7 |
| Not Ascertained | 5 | 14 | 3 | 13 | 8 | 13 |
| TOTAL | 36 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 60 | 100 |

TABLE 18

OCCUPATIONS OF FATHERS OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

| Fathers' Occupations* | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Professionals | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 11 | 4 | 9 |
| Managers, Proprietors, Farm Owners | 25 | 13 | 16 | 11 | 41 | 12 | 4 | 15 | --- | --- | 4 | 9 |
| Clerical or Sales Workers | 16 | 9 | 11 | 8 | 27 | 8 | 1 | 4 | ---- | --- | 1 | 2 |
| Craftsmen, Foremen, etc. | 52 | 27 | 41 | 28 | 93 | 28 | 11 | 41 | 4 | 21 | 15 | 33 |
| Operatives | 67 | 35 | 53 | 37 | 120 | 36 | 7 | 26 | 8 | 42 | 15 | 33 |
| Service and Private Household Workers | 17 | 9 | 12 | 8 | 29 | 9 | ---- | ---- | 2 | 11 | 2 | 4 |
| Laborers | 8 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 15 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 16 | 5 | 11 |
| TOTAL** | 190 | 100 | 145 | 100 | 335 | 100 | 27 | 100 | 19 | 101 | 46 | 101*** |

lassified according to: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population, lphabetical Index of Occupations and Industries (rev. ed.) (Washington, D.C.: .S. Government Printing Office, 1960

**Excluded are 230 dropouts (41 percent) and 14 returnees (23 per cent) for whom fathers' occupation was not ascertained.

***Percentage does not total 100 due to rounding off.

TABLE 19

WELFARE HISTORIES OF FAMILIES OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES, BY SEX*

| Welfare History | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| No cases** | 199 | 63 | 128 | 51 | 327 | 58 | 28 | 78 | 14 | 61 | 42 | 71 |
| One case | 43 | 14 | 36 | 14 | 79 | 14 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 5 |
| 2 or more cases | 71 | 23 | 88 | 35 | 159 | 28 | 7 | 19 | 7 | 30 | 14 | 24 |
| TOTAL*** | 313 | 100 | 252 | 100 | 565 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 23 | 100 | 59 | 100 |

*Only aid received through the Onondaga County Department of Social Welfare was included. Some families received such aid as early as 1936.

**"Case" refers to one type of assistance, e. g. aid to dependent children at one period of time. In its history a family may receive aid to dependent children three times and would, therefore, have three cases on its record. Also, a family may receive several types of aid.

***Total excludes 1 returnee girl whose family received assistance but number of cases was not ascertained.

TABLE 20

WELFARE HISTORIES OF FAMILIES OF PERMANENT

DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

CONDENSED TABLE

| Welfare History | Dropouts No. | % | Returnees No. | % | Total No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No record | 327 | 58 | 42 | 70 | 369 | 59 |
| Has record | 238 | 42 | 18 | 30 | 256 | 41 |
| TOTAL | 565 | 100 | 60 | 100 | 625 | 100 |

$X^2 = 3.30$
df = 1
$P < .05$

$Xy^2 = 2.83$
df = 1
$P > .05$

TABLE 21

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA OF RESIDENCE OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES, BY SEX

| Socio-Economic Area* | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| I (high) | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| II | 11 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 16 | 3 | 2 | 6 | --- | --- | 2 | 3 |
| III | 40 | 13 | 14 | 6 | 54 | 10 | 7 | 19 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 13 |
| IV | 57 | 18 | 37 | 15 | 94 | 17 | 10 | 28 | 6 | 25 | 16 | 27 |
| V | 78 | 25 | 74 | 29 | 152 | 27 | 8 | 22 | 11 | 46 | 19 | 32 |
| VI (low) | 110 | 35 | 108 | 43 | 218 | 38 | 7 | 19 | 5 | 21 | 12 | 20 |
| Outside City or Not Ascertained | 13 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 24 | 4 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TOTAL | 313 | 100 | 252 | 100 | 565 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 60 | 100 |

*Refers to residence at time of leaving school.

TABLE 22

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA OF RESIDENCE OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

CONDENSED TABLE

| Socio-Economic Area | Dropouts No. | % | Returnees No. | % | Total No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I V | 323 | 60 | 48 | 80 | 371 | 62 |
| VI | 218 | 40 | 12 | 20 | 230 | 38 |
| TOTAL* | 541 | 100 | 60 | 100 | 601 | 100 |

*Excludes 24 dropouts for whom residence at time of leaving school was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 9.42$
$Xv^2 = 8.58$
df = 1
$P < .01$

TABLE 23

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA OF RESIDENCE OF DROPOUT AND RETURNEE BOYS

CONDENSED TABLE

| Socio-Economic Area | Dropout Boys | | Returnee Boys | | Total Boys | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| I-V | 190 | 63 | 29 | 81 | 219 | 65 |
| VI | 110 | 37 | 7 | 19 | 117 | 35 |
| TOTAL* | 300 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 336 | 100 |

*Excludes 13 dropout boys for whom residence was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 4.20$ $Xy^2 = 3.48$
df = 1 df = 1
$P < .05$ $P > .05$

TABLE 24

SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA OF RESIDENCE OF DROPOUT AND RETURNEE GIRLS

CONDENSED TABLE

| Socio-Economic Area | Dropout Girls No. | % | Returnee Girls No. | % | Total Girls No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I V | 133 | 55 | 19 | 79 | 152 | 57 |
| VI | 108 | 45 | 5 | 21 | 113 | 43 |
| TOTAL* | 241 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 265 | 100 |

*Excludes 11 dropout girls for whom residence was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 5.13$
$Xy^2 = 4.19$
df = 1
$P < .05$

TABLE 25

PERCENTAGE OF ALL DROPOUTS RETURNING TO SCHOOL,
BY SOCIO-ECONOMIC AREA OF RESIDENCE AND BY SEX

| Socio-Economic Area | Boys | | | | Girls | | | | Total | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | Percent Who Are Returnees | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | Percent Who Are Returnees | Dropouts | Returnees | Total | Percent Who Are Returnees |
| I (high) | 4 | 2 | 6 | 33.0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 25.0 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 30.0 |
| II | 11 | 2 | 13 | 15.4 | 5 | ---- | 5 | 0. | 16 | 2 | 18 | 11.1 |
| III | 40 | 7 | 47 | 14.9 | 14 | 1 | 15 | 6.7 | 54 | 8 | 62 | 12.9 |
| IV | 57 | 10 | 67 | 14.9 | 37 | 6 | 43 | 14.0 | 94 | 16 | 110 | 14.5 |
| V | 78 | 8 | 86 | 9.3 | 74 | 11 | 85 | 12.9 | 152 | 19 | 171 | 11.1 |
| VI (low) | 110 | 7 | 117 | 6.0 | 108 | 5 | 113 | 4.4 | 218 | 12 | 230 | 5.2 |
| TOTAL** | 300 | 36 | 336 | 10.7 | 241 | 24 | 265 | 9.1 | 541 | 60 | 601 | 10.0 |

*Refers to residence at time of leaving school.

**Excludes 13 dropouts boys and 11 dropout girls for whom residence was not ascertained.

TABLE 26

TYPE OF FAMILY SITUATION OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND REUTRNEES, BY SEX

| Youth lived With | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Mother and Father | 182 | 58 | 134 | 53 | 316 | 56 | 26 | 72 | 19 | 79 | 45 | 75 |
| One Parent Only | 68 | 22 | 48 | 19 | 116 | 20 | 5 | 14 | 3 | 13 | 8 | 13 |
| One Parent and One Stepparent | 22 | 7 | 28 | 11 | 50 | 9 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 8 |
| Guardians, Alone or In an Institution | 15 | 5 | 25 | 10 | 40 | 7 | 1 | 3 | --- | --- | 1 | 2 |
| Not Ascertained | 26 | 8 | 17 | 7 | 43 | 8 | 1 | 3 | --- | --- | 1 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 313 | 100 | 252 | 100 | 565 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 60 | 100 |

TABLE 27

TYPE OF FAMILY SITUATION OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

CONDENSED TABLE

| Youth lived With | Dropouts No. | % | Returnees No. | % | Total No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mother and Father | 316 | 61 | 45 | 76 | 361 | 62 |
| Other | 206 | 39 | 14 | 24 | 220 | 38 |
| TOTAL* | 522 | 100 | 59 | 100 | 581 | 100 |

*Excluded are 43 dropouts and 1 returnee for whom residence was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 5.58$

$Xy^2 = 4.93$

df = 1

$P < .05$

TABLE 28

TYPE OF FAMILY SITUATION OF DROPOUT AND RETURNEE BOYS

CONDENSED TABLE

| Youth Lived With | Dropout Boys No. | % | Returnee Boys No. | % | Total Boys No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mother and Father | 182 | 63 | 26 | 74 | 208 | 65 |
| Other | 105 | 37 | 9 | 26 | 114 | 35 |
| TOTAL* | 287 | 100 | 35 | 100 | 322 | 100 |

*Excluded are 26 dropout boys and 1 returnee boys for whom residence was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 1.61$
$Xy^2 = 1.17$
df = 1
$P < .05$

TABLE 29

TYPE OF FAMILY SITUATION OF DROPOUT AND RETURNEE GIRLS

CONDENSED TABLE

| Youth Lived With | Dropout Girls No. | % | Returnee Girls No. | % | Total Girls No. | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mother and Father | 134 | 57 | 19 | 79 | 153 | 59 |
| Other | 101 | 43 | 5 | 21 | 106 | 41 |
| TOTAL* | 235 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 259 | 100 |

*Excludes 17 dropout girls for whom residence was not ascertained.

$X^2 = 4.42$ $X_y^2 = 3.55$

df = 1 df = 1

$P < .05$ $P > .05$

TABLE 30

CENTRAL REGISTRY OF JUVENILE OFFENDERS

LISTINGS OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES, BY SEX

| Central Registry Listing* | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Not listed | 228 | 73 | 224 | 89 | 452 | 80 | 26 | 72 | 22 | 92 | 48 | 80 |
| 1 or 2 Offenses | 58 | 18 | 21 | 8 | 79 | 14 | 8 | 22 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 15 |
| 3 or more offenses | 27 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 34 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 |
| TOTAL | 313 | 100 | 252 | 100 | 565 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 60 | 100 |

*The Registry's earliest information is for the year 1957. Consequently, any offense committed by a youth who was 16 before 1957 (or 18 or older in 1959-60) would not be listed. This fact indicates a possible underreporting of juvenile offenses.

TABLE 31

POLICE DEPARTMENT LISTINGS OF PERMANENT DROPOUTS AND RETURNEES

BY SEX

| Police Department Listing* | Dropouts | | | | | | Returnees | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Boys | | Girls | | Total | | Boys | | Girls | | Total | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| Not listed | 255 | 82 | 240 | 95 | 495 | 88 | 32 | 89 | 22 | 92 | 54 | 90 |
| 1 or 2 offenses | 48 | 15 | 10 | 4 | 58 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 8 |
| 3 or more offenses | 10 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 1 | 3 | --- | --- | 1 | 2 |
| TOTAL | 313 | 100 | 252 | 100 | 565 | 100 | 36 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 60 | 100 |

* Records checked as of March, 1962.

TABLE 32

ANALYSIS OF COMBINED CHARACTERISTICS YIELDING A HIGH PROPORTION OF BOYS RETURNING TO SCHOOL

| Line | VARIABLES Socio-economic Area | Years Retarded | Grade Achieved | Type of Home | Family Welfare Record | Total Number | % who are Returnees |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 349 | 10 |
| b | I | --- | --- | --- | --- | 6 | 33 |
| c | I-IV | --- | --- | --- | --- | 133 | 16 |
| d | --- | 0 | --- | --- | --- | 41 | 22 |
| e | --- | 0,1 | --- | --- | --- | 129 | 16 |
| f | --- | --- | 10,12 | --- | --- | 203 | 14 |
| g | I-IV | 0 | --- | --- | --- | 18 | 28 |
| h | I-IV | 0,1 | --- | --- | --- | 49 | 25 |
| i | I-IV | 0,1 | 10-12 | --- | --- | 43 | 28 |
| j | I-IV | 0,1 | 10,12 | unbroken | --- | 28 | 25 |
| k | I-IV | 0,1 | 10,12 | --- | no | 36 | 25 |
| l | I-IV | 0,1 | 10,12 | --- | yes | 7 | 29 |

Notes: A dash (---) indicates that variable was not taken into account.

The table should be read as follows (see line g): of the 18 boys who were from socio-economic areas I-IV and were not retarded in grade level, 28 per cent were returnees.

TABLE 33

ANALYSIS OF COMBINED CHARACTERISTICS WHICH YIELD A HIGH PROPORTION OF GIRLS RETURNING TO SCHOOL

| Line | VARIABLES | | | | | Total Number | % who are Returnees |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Socio-economic Area | Years Retarded | Grade Achieved | Type of Home | Family Welfare Record | | |
| a | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 276 | 9 |
| b | --- | 0 | --- | --- | --- | 76 | 15 |
| c | --- | 0,1 | --- | --- | --- | 155 | 13 |
| d | --- | --- | 12 | --- | --- | 35 | 17 |
| e | --- | --- | 11,12 | --- | --- | 120 | 14 |
| f | I-IV | --- | --- | --- | --- | 67 | 12 |
| g | I-V | --- | --- | --- | --- | 152 | 13 |
| h | --- | 0 | 12 | --- | --- | 24 | 21 |
| i | I-IV | 0 | 12 | --- | --- | 6 | 50 |
| j | I-V | 0 | 12 | --- | --- | 13 | 39 |
| k | --- | 0 | 12 | unbroken | --- | 10 | 40 |
| l | I-V | 0,1 | 12 | --- | --- | 16 | 31 |
| m | I-V | 0,1 | 12 | unbroken | --- | 8 | 50 |
| n | I-V | 0,1 | --- | --- | --- | 78 | 22 |
| o | I-V | 0,1 | 11,12 | --- | --- | 57 | 23 |
| p | I-V | 0,1 | 11,12 | unbroken | --- | 35 | 29 |
| q | I-V | 0,1 | 11,12 | unbroken | yes | 9 | 33 |

Notes: A dash (---) indicates that variable was not taken into account.

The table should be read as follows (see line h): of the 24 girls who were not retarded and had reached grade 12, 21 per cent were returnees.